

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 1 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

Location: Arizona Game and Fish Department Pinetop Regional Office, 2878 East White Mountain Boulevard, Pinetop, AZ 85935
Date: January 29-30, 2008
Time: AZ Time: 0900 – 1700 on January 29 and 0800 - 1200 on January 30
Host: Arizona Game and Fish Department
Participants: AGFD - Terry B. Johnson (Chair), Dave Cagle, Mike Godwin, Mike Sumner, Jon Cooley (FOR1 Supervisor); NMDGF – Matt Wonder, Ellen Heilhecker; USFS – Cathy Taylor; USFWS - John Morgart, John Oakleaf; USDA-APHIS WS - Chris Carrillo, Ken Podborne, Sterling Simpson; WMAT - Krista Beazley; NMDA – Bud Starnes; Graham Co - Mark Harrington, Terry Cooper; Greenlee Co – Hector Ruedas, Kay Gayle; Navajo Co - Jerry Brownlow; SCAT - Steve Titla, SCAT

1. Introductions/Welcome

2. Agenda Review/Comments - None.

3. Director's Summit – Terry Johnson provided meeting notes to the group. Hector noted clarification to meeting notes to include notation on needs for “staffing and funding.” Terry noted where this clarification needs to go.

4. Misc Items

a. AMOC Meetings

a. April 22/23 – Reserve, NM:

- i. April 22: AMOC 9 am - 5 pm, AMWG 6 pm - 9 pm
- ii. April 23: AMOC 9 am - 3 pm

b. July 29-31 – Morenci, AZ

- i. July 29: AMOC-IFT 10 am - 5 pm (Greenlee Co. will host dinner)
- ii. July 30: AMOC-IFT 8 am - 4 pm, AMWG 6 pm - 9pm
- iii. July 31: Directors meeting 9 am - 3 pm

c. October 28/29 – Silver City, NM

- i. October 28: AMOC 9 am - 5 pm, AMWG 6 pm - 9 pm
- ii. October 29: AMOC 9 am - 3 pm

d. December 9-11 – Director's Summit (no AMWG Session)

- i. Dec 9: AMOC-IFT 10 am - 5 pm
- ii. Dec 10: AMOC-IFT 8 am - 5 pm
- iii. Dec 11: Directors-AMOC-IFT 8 am - 3 pm; Xmas party in evening

b. ES Updates: Terry asked if anyone is not signed up to receive updates - no response

- a. AGFD Commissioners need to be added to distribution list
- b. Encourage people/groups to sign up if interested.

c. TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION

- a. TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.
- b. TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 2 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

- c. TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.
- d. TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.
- d. Rabies Issues – Chris Carrillo, WS presentation – PowerPoint provided to group
 - a. Chris provided data on positive rabies cases in wolf reintroduction area (Apache, Graham, Greenlee, Navajo Co's – AZ only). Fox and bobcat positives only, so far. Rabid dog in eagle creek and R. coyote in NM are other likely positive cases.
 - b. Rabies Research ongoing – samples from captive wolves to determine effectiveness of rabies vaccines. Goal is to license vaccine for wolves.
 - c. Funding needed for ongoing research.
 - d. Questions:
 - i. Incidents in AZ – how addressed/handled by WS and likelihood of transmission to adjoining SCAT from Eagle Creek. TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION. Greenlee Co. offered support to Tribe in keeping them informed and involved as circumstances dictate going forward.
 - e. AGFD provided handout on new Dept. Wolf Handling Protocol – rabies vaccination policies for employees.
 - i. SCAT requested support in providing training to SCAT personnel on rabies issues, vaccinations, animal handling, etc. Terry suggested that this be approached through WS, which serves as the technical expert on this issue.
- e. AGFD – proactive incentives update:
 - a. Small grants available to local ranches in AZ – 3 owners/operators on board now; potential to increase to 20-30. Efforts targeted at mitigating risks to livestock from wolves - feed, fencing, etc.
 - b. State and Private funds used to fund these projects – no Fed funds involved in the program.
 - c. TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.
 - d. Question asked about NMGFD assistance to ranchers in Gila area- postpone discussion to later agenda item (Other Business) – **Action Item**
- f. AZA Request – Removal/Lethal Take Moratorium
 - a. Deliberative document not to be shared outside of agencies. Greenlee, Graham, Navajo counties noted their recommendation to not comply with the request.
 - b. Directors will work on and provide a collective response to request. Draft letter will be shared with AMOC before final signature – not sure yet how letter will be presented/sent (e.g. letterhead/sender).
 - c. Terry noted that this request is not influencing current management practices – no changes to protocols/procedures resulting from this letter.
 - d. TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.
- g. Draft Project Status Summary

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 3 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

- a. Terry noted that wolf numbers need to be updated to complete this document
 - b. **Action Item** – IFT provide needed updates to document and send final draft to Terry. Terry will review/approve before public distribution occurs. Any AMOC comments need to get to Oakleaf ASAP – none received thus far through previous AMOC conversations.
- h. MW Guide/Outfitter SUP
- a. Cathy Taylor received no comments since last meeting. IFT discussed the current draft and submitted proposed guideline revisions at the last AMOC meeting (Socorro, NM). Handout provided to group, though Cathy noted that the handouts were not correct version.
 - b. Terry asked in difference identified between educational and commercial operators – Cathy said that USFS has not made that distinction in current SUP guidelines. Noted that this may present a challenge in managing SUP holders.
 - c. Group agreed to extend completion of guidelines another 2 weeks to allow time for AMOC to provide comments/recommendations on language and structure of SUP. AMOC needs to provide comments to Cathy Taylor by COB FEBUARY 12, 2008 – **Action Item**.
- i. NEPA Scoping Update
- a. 12,300 email comments, 1000 mail comments received through comment period – some were form letters/emails. Process now is to categorize by keywords relating to project issues - DJ Case will complete keyword search. DJ Case plans to have report to USFWS by end of March. Once scoping complete, USFWS will compile range of alternatives based on comments.
 - b. Slown stated that AMOC will have opportunity to discuss package before it goes public.
 - c. Morgart mentioned that one thing that came up in scoping – questions over appropriateness of AMOC agencies providing comments in the scoping. USFWS Solicitors advise that it is not a problem for AMOC member agencies to provide comments in NEPA scoping – fits with the general intent/purpose of scoping process.
 - d. Terry noted that AMOC agreed previously that cooperating agencies would not provide scoping comments, as these would be reflected through the 37 recommendations identified through the 5-year review. Terry was concerned that this may require the scoping process to be redone, thus the legal inquiry to USFWS Solicitors.
 - e. Steve Titla asked about the decision making process on the scoping comments – stated concerns over conflict of interest on the part of AMOC.
 - f. Terry clarified that AMOC is not decision making body on NEPA. May have a role in developing/recommending alternatives, but does not make decisions on these alternatives. Dr. Tuggle (and higher USFWS positions) are responsible for making decisions relating to the EIS and the direction of the project.

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 4 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

- g. Lead Agency status on EIS – (MOU): Slown noted that SCAT and NM Counties are requesting to be added through MOU addendum. 18 requests to date.
 - i. Morgart noted that these requests are creating a logistical problem for USFWS. Good to have the interest and desire to engage but EIS hurdles exist. Will recommend to Dr. Tuggle to proceed with these addendums but it will create administrative issues.
 - ii. Terry noted that there was a difference intended to be captured in the MOU between Cooperator and Lead Agency status, and asked what the criteria were for USFWS evaluating how these designations would be determined going forward. Morgart noted that Dr. Tuggle ultimately owns the decisions on this process but that those decisions will be sensitive to AMOC issues/concerns in order to maintain integrity of the process.
 - iii. Steve Titla again raised concerns/questions over the decision making process in USFWS, noting that they feel removed from the AMOC process. Terry countered by raising the point that AMOC has presented a number of opportunities to SCAT to join AMOC through formal/informal means in an effort to have SCAT engage with AMOC. Also pointed out that AMOC would not have the grounds to reject any governmental agencies' desire to join AMOC.
 - iv. Bud Starnes made a motion that if USFWS decides to reject cooperator/lead agency status those entities receive an automatic "informational status." Terry added that if that takes place that USFWS not require additional applications for those entities to obtain this status.
 - v. Cathy Taylor explained that USFS is making changes to nationalized process on many administrative processes, including NEPA. Outsourcing of NEPA has been put on hold as a result of a look at centralizing this, and other USFS administrative processes (into a set of national "centers" that will perform these functions – efficiency and compliance with national law/process requirements). Not clear what expectations are for USFS on NEPA and waiting for clearer direction.
 - vi. Once DJ Case presents compilation of scoping, Lead agencies will need to determine how work related to the completion of the EIS will be distributed among agencies. Stated objective of AMOC to not involve IFT in this workload – maintain field focus.
- j. Lead Agency Staff Changes and TDAs:
 - a. Terry noted that this is on the agenda to clarify/highlight IFT current staffing and to highlight staffing shortages/needs based on IFT work plans and activities.
 - b. AGFD Outreach position (temporary) has expired and currently being evaluated by AGFD. IFT Leader position also being evaluated for potential classification change.
 - c. AGFD noted concern over upcoming **NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION REDACTION**.

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 5 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

- d. USFWS noted that they have 2 vacancies – Stark’s old position is being advertised and closes in couple of weeks. The other will be soon open for application. Hope to have “Stark position” to filled shortly.
 - i. Oakleaf’s absence: no person in place, but working on a potential TDA through USFWS. **Action Item** – Morgart will finalize this assignment before Oakleaf goes on leave.
 - ii. Assistant position to Morgart – EIS Specialist position (John Slown) is being funded under this position. Morgart noted that Regional Director has approved filling the Asst. position and a second position to captive program (in addition to M. Wolff vacancy). Also moving on getting student position (temporary)- assigned to Alpine Field Office.
 - iii. Terry asked about role of “Stark” position since his previous work involved research. Noted needs from Tribes in particular. Morgart responded that the position should be FT IFT position and can be assigned/used where ever needed. Asked about role of Assistant position – recovery planning focus would be good.
 - iv. Assigned Maggie detail to IFT is also an option for USFWS.
- e. USDA-WS: No change from current staffing.
- f. **TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**
- g. NMGFD: Matt stated that interviews winding down on IFT Leader position – down to 2 good candidates.
 - i. Hope to have final hire offer by end of this week or early next. Hope to have person in the field couple weeks thereafter. Job description states duty post of Catron/Sierra Counties. Terry asked about job functions, especially as it relates to outreach duties performed by IFT. Matt noted that they do want IFT Leader to perform/maintain contacts in NM, but do not expect IFT-wide outreach duties to be performed by the Leader.
 - ii. Funds to pick up ¼ FTE to assist IFT after IFT Leader gets settled.
- h. USFS: now finalizing their position description, which will based out of Alpine Office. Do not know if comes out as standard position description – has to be graded at national level before it can be advertised. All HR process is struggling now due to changes/reorganization within USFS so will take some time.
 - i. **Action Item:** IFT evaluate office space to accommodate USFS position. Advise Cathy Taylor on status.
 - ii. New Regional Forester: Discussion among executive/management taking place but no direction provided on wolf matters. Terry noted the need for USFS to provide AMOC direction on how to involve/contact USFS Albq. On wolf matters (pursuant to protocols – actions involving wolves).
- i. **TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**
- j. Outreach: With expiration of AGFD Outreach position, IFT will compile a list of outreach activities/responsibilities and propose a plan on how we address those responsibilities through agencies going forward. **Action Item**
- k. 2008 Budget Table – IFT Work Plan

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 6 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

- a. Handout provided to group – consolidated work plan for IFT. (Activities outlined on chart correspond to activities summarized in IFT work plan document).
 - b. Terry noted the absence of SCAT under USFWS – Morgart stated that this activity is included under the “USFWS” heading (not broken down under subset).
 - c. Terry noted that one more information item is needed from NMGFD before the final package to Directors can be completed - discussed with Matt (they understand what Terry’s talking about).
 - d. Group agreed that the spreadsheet approach in quantifying workload is very helpful – would like to use this format going forward in evaluating and presenting IFT work plan information. Major KUDOS to Morgart for his investment of time in working through, reformatting and compiling this information.
 - e. Terry asked if AMOC wants to have a follow up conference call on work plan before it goes to Directors. **Action Item** – Morgart complete work plan chart/summary and distribute to AMOC. Terry will send same to Directors.
 - f. **TRIBAL INFORMATION REDACTION.**
- l. IFT Workloads
- a. No significant discussion, referring back to preceding item/discussion relating to IFT staffing and workload management.
- m. IFT Draft Annual Reports – 2007
- a. IFT working on year end report toward closure at April AMOC meeting on documents. Draft provided by Feb. 20 –current timeline. March 15 to AMOC.
 - b. Recovery report: Same schedule as IFT report, lagging slightly behind.
- n. 2008 Initial Releases/Translocations – IFT **Action Item**
- a. Terry summarized points raised by Directors on this point at December 2007 AMOC meeting, noting that Directors were looking for a revised proposal from IFT, including evaluation of additional proposed releases in 2008. Also looking for release/translocation proposals/opportunities for 2009 (this was request from AGFD Director, as summarized by Terry).
 - i. Pro/Con analysis from IFT on any proposed releases/translocations should be included in this recommendation package.
 - ii. All IFT Leaders must review/discuss with Oakleaf before AMOC receives IFT recommendation package. Package will reflect position of respective IFT Leaders on recommendations/package.
 - iii. AGFD is also requesting a summary of wolves available for release/translocation from captivity to aid in the evaluation of alternatives (to be provided by John Morgart/USFWS). Morgart briefly described the information he has compiled to date, noting that it’s about 95% done. **Action Item** – Morgart will provide final list to AGFD/AMOC once completed in about 2-3 weeks. Info relates to Sevilleta and Ladder captive facilities.

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 7 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

- iv. Discussion within group on how IFT evaluates carrying capacity for wolves for areas that are being considered for releases/translocations – goals should be established accordingly.
 - 1. Would be beneficial for IFT to address concepts of pack territoriality, spacing, etc. (carrying capacity variables) to assist with the evaluation of adding wolves to population. This level of analysis and discussion has been absent from previous release/translocation recommendation packages.
 - 2. Refer to existing data and trend information to assist with carry capacity evaluation, which can be refined and updated as project progresses and experience is gained at the field level (including game/prey base, as available).
 - v. Oakleaf provided a brief summary of handout that was provided to the group – draft IFT proposal for release/translocation. Action Item for IFT to revisit the proposal(s) and revise for AMOC presentation – All IFT Leaders need to have reviewed before AMOC sees the final IFT package.
- o. M1039 Translocation Issues
- a. Matt Wunder briefed the group on this issue – translocation of wolf picked up near Grants, NM. Location and manner of release created controversy – highlighted process on notifying residents, permittees, etc. when these activities take place. Residents had complained about lack of sufficient notification and the proximity of release site to permanent residences.
 - i. Matt explained that NMGFD decided to not provide receivers/frequency to local residents, which created a PR issue for the agency.
 - ii. Morgart pointed out the process/protocol IFT has used in coordinating release/translocations, including relying upon constituent networks to assist in the dissemination of information to affected areas.
 - iii. Matt noted that part of the citizen complaint on the handling related to the absence of local “representatives” (e.g. town official/agency) be part of the contact-pool. Matt stated that it might be useful to include town/community contacts if they fall within the 10 mile notification radius.
 - 1. Terry noted the process burdens associated with including towns/communities, and the likely problems tied to being able to actually contact designated officials during off-hours. Also noted that protocols leave it up to the jurisdictional lead to decide how receivers are distributed to impacted residents/locals.
 - b. Terry asked to focus discussion on what we learned and how we do business going forward – noting that AGFD’s preference is to give frequencies once we decide to provide receivers to individuals.
 - i. Morgart noted the value of maintaining flexibility on how we address these issues and not to get to a point that we build a cookbook or standardized response to every similar situation.

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 8 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

- ii. Terry noted that agency coordination and appropriate/respective deference is necessary to maintain some reasonable level of consistency on how IFT handles these types of situations – specifically USFWS coordinating directly with States or Tribes when these field activities are being addressed. MOU is clear on including all agencies and trying to achieve consensus on these types of management actions.
- iii. Ken also noted that part of the problem (from his discussion with the people involved) is that the public wants to receive more information about wolves and wolf program. Matt noted that they made efforts to work with the individuals involved without much success.
- c. Group agreed that IFT (Oakleaf)/AMOC (Matt) should continue to work at arranging a presentation to this community/group (Lake Roberts). **Action Item** for Oakleaf/Wunder.
- p. SOP 5.0 Memo
 - a. Out for public comment – handout provided to group.
 - b. Discuss at AMWG tomorrow. Agency concurrence that we are now implementing this SOP.
- q. SOP6.0 Memo
 - a. Out for public comment– handout provided to group.
 - b. Discuss at AMWG tomorrow. Agency concurrence that we are now implementing this SOP.
- r. SOP 11.0 Memo
 - a. Deliberative – not out for public comment– handout provided to group.
 - b. Reference to Terry’s email summary of points raised by Dr. Tuggle on SOP 11/13 clarification memos. (Many of these points relate to/stem from recent High Country News story)
 - i. Dr. Tuggle has reviewed and approved draft language – invites AMOC discussion/comment but if there are concerns he wants the comments to go to Dr. Tuggle through Agency Directors (they will then discuss and resolve). If no comment, then Dr. Tuggle is comfortable with draft going forward for public review.
 - ii. USDA NM and Greenlee Co. do not want any changes to current protocol – do not want proposed language adopted. Expressed concerns over USFWS ability to perform duties outlined in SOP (co-investigations with WS – Dr. Tuggle’s email bullet a.).
 - 1. Morgart provided explanation to County’s questions about why USFWS feels they need to have 2 federal agencies involved in investigations.
 - a. Kay Gale responded by noting the County’s concern that this process creates the necessity for USFWS to ensure adequate staffing of the IFT in order to perform these duties

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 9 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

without holding up timely completion of investigations. Greenlee County has repeatedly identified lack of sufficient staffing and funding as a major problem in this Project. Group referred to work plan projections on staffing needs related to depredation investigation activities.

- b. Bud Starnes stated that leaving out how project addresses impropriety on part of livestock operator, if detected through investigation. Need to clearly identify the consequences, which should not necessarily include dropping a possibly legitimate depredation incident. Need to be direct and clear with public – e.g. call in Law Enforcement investigation, and may restore “strike” against wolf if depredation is confirmed.
 - c. Question asked on how decision to co-investigate is made and how co-investigation is then executed (who involved through what process, under what timelines and requiring what resources to perform effectively – meet expectation). Counties raised objections over the complexity of these additional SOP processes and procedures, which serve to further aggravate what the public perceives as an already slow and inefficient procedure in the wolf project. Hector noted that the public is getting more upset with the way these things are being handled through the project on these depredations.
 - d. Cathy Taylor suggested simplifying by deleting wording that Terry has noted on his copy (last sentence of bullet a.)
- iii. Bullet b.
- 1. Chris noted the necessity for use of “coordinate,” “cooperate,” etc. and this may be simplified by eliminating too many of these c’s.
 - 2. Question about WS/USFWS arrival and processing of site incidents – arrival times and coordination.
- iv. Bullet c.
- 1. USFWS will need to determine what aspects are necessary/relevant to their investigations in the realm of biological investigations.
- v. Bullet d.
- 1. Recovery Coordinator reference should include “/Designee”.
 - 2. State laws guide many of the limitations to private property.
 - 3. If one granted permission but the other denied, the one permitted agency will go on with investigation with findings serving as official IFT determination.
- vi. Bullet e.
- 1. Incident Investigator determines whether or not wolf kill, not co-investigator.
- vii. Bullet f.

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 10 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

1. no comments
- viii. Bullet g.
 1. 72 hour turnaround necessary to comply with removal actions that may accompany 3-strike situations.
 2. Questions asked about use of words/concepts relating to “baiting” of wolves. Much of this relates to 10j.
- ix. Bullet h.
 1. Question asked about owner denial/not assigning an incident – as worded, reflects negative and accusatory tone. Propose adding “or shall not” after “shall.”
 2. Point also made that we need to define “baiting” and “attraction,” and what practices or methods fall into these categories. This will get into realm of legal interpretations that USFWS will need to complete. The grey area will occur when practices, typical to a livestock operation (e.g. kill piles), can be interpreted incorrectly to the peril of the operator/producer. Intentional baiting is the easy determination, but there is potential for a whole set of other activities that will complicate this analysis/determination.
 3. Question asked on access to private property – only reason for operator to bait is to get an additional strike. Under this proposed protocol, will never be able to determine this worse-case/likely scenario is occurring if/when they don’t allow access (likely not going to take place on public lands). “Backward logic” being used in this protocol.
 4. Lawful presence of approved stocking levels of livestock also noted as a potential “baiting” interpretation if stocking is above or otherwise found not to comply with what has been permitted.
 5. Bud raised concerns about the experience/skill level of USFWS personnel that will ultimately be put into position of performing co-investigations, and the practical value of biological investigations that flow from their involvement.
- x. Bullet i.
 1. Need to determine process through which IFT will evaluate these “reports”.
- xi. Bullet j.
 1. No questions/comments.
- c. Kay asked if investigation has been completed – relating to the allegations surfacing through the High Country News article. Morgart replied that he does not know because once it gets into LE realm, he and USFWS folks involved in the project are out the loop.
- d. Kay also noted that these proposed changes give appearance that USFWS is jumping to conclusion that issues/allegations noted in High Country News article are fact/true.

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 11 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

- s. SOP 13.0 Memo
 - a. Discussion in reference information in Dr. Tuggle's email message on SOP13, Clarification Memo #4:
 - b. Kay Gayle interjected that the County intends to follow up with Dr. Tuggle on questions relating to SOP11 relating to true motivations behind changes to this SOP. Also feel like it is not worthwhile to pursue discussion SOP13 because the County feels that decision has already been made on adopting the changes outlined thus far. Kay feels that political processes are driving decisions relating to the wolf project now, especially in view of the national elections that are now in play. Navajo, Graham, Greenlee Counties stand behind this perspective and share this position on the wolf project.
 - c. Hector stated that the County intends to have a discussion with Dr. Tuggle on these issues, following up on the offer that Dr. Tuggle presented at the last AMOC meeting.
 - d. Back to SOP13, CM#4:
 - i. Hector pointed out that in the Deliberative Draft, the word "final" needs to be included with reference to "removal order" in order to maintain consistency and clarity of intent.
 - ii. Bullet a:
 - 1. Question on whether or not this removes lethal take: Terry responded that this does not remove lethal take as an option. Kay noted request at last AMOC meeting that it be made clear that lethal take remains an option, which she feels this draft language does not sufficiently capture/reflect.
 - 2. USDA-WS asked question about trapping alternatives/language, and Chris was asked to channel their concerns through agency in order to provide comments back to AMOC on SOP language.
 - 3. Also noted that this does not automatically apply to WMAT or SCAT unless they elect to adopt these procedures.
 - 4. Questions asked about captive facility constraints influencing field decisions involving removals, and Terry stated that AMOC/IFT is working under the basis that captive facility situations/conditions do not factor into how depredating wolves will be managed.
 - iii. Bullet b:
 - 1. Concerns discussed under SOP11 carry over to this SOP, as they relate to the concerns over "baiting" and "attraction" criteria.
 - 2. Group feels adding word "intentional" to baiting and attraction references will help clarify the intent.
 - 3. Question about clarifying language to address cases where denying access will result in no incident being assigned. This needs to be clarified in this SOP and SOP11.
 - iv. Bullet c:
 - 1. No comments.

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 12 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

- e. Discussion reference Deliberative Draft SOP13 with Track Changes comments from Bruce Thompson:
 - i. B/Purpose: Terry noted that this proposed change will make this SOP different from other comparable sections of other SOPs.
 - 1. Steve Titla noted that he is concerned that this language
 - 2. AGFD disagrees with the proposed changes. Not a value added change. Graham, Greenlee and Navajo Co., USFS, USDA-WS and USFWS concur with this assessment. Feeling that adaptive management has been part of process from beginning (“henceforth” is not value-added)
 - 3. NMGFD stands by their Director’s proposed language.
 - ii. Section #2:
 - 1. Graham, Greenlee, Navajo Counties, SCAT, USDA-WS do not want the proposed change.
 - 2. SCAT feels this language lessens/minimizes the need for removals and is, therefore, concerned about a shift in management occurring. NMGFD affirmed that this is was exactly the intent given the perspective that the project has been moving quickly
 - 3. USFS, NMGFD, AGFD, NMDA, USFWS agree with the proposed change. Feel that this clearly states the intent – a reminder that there are other options to consider in managing wolves.
 - 4. No consensus – MOU states that Lead Agencies have to resolve: 4-2 to make the change to the Deliberative Draft SOP13.
 - iii. Section 1/b:
 - 1. NMDA, Greenlee, Graham, Navajo, NMDA, oppose change – leave as is.
 - 2. SCAT, USFWS, NMGFD, USFWS, WMAT, AGFD offered change to word “decision.”
 - iv. Section 4/d:
 - 1. AGFD, USFWS, NMDA, USFS, SCAT, Navajo, Graham, Greenlee, WMAT no change – leave as is.
 - 2. USDA-WS, NMGFD good with adopting suggested change.
 - 3. No deletion.
 - v. Section 4e,g and 5 (word “written”):
 - 1. Question on impact of timing and timelines – Terry stated should have no impact as we have been working through email. Doesn’t change process/timelines.
 - 2. WMAT, NMGFD, SCAT, Navajo, Greenlee, Graham, USDA-WS, USFWS, USFS, AGFD OK with adopting proposed change.
 - 3. No members opposed to change.
 - vi. Section 5: (minority reports)
 - 1. USFWS, USDA-WS, USFS, SCAT, NMGFD all OK with adopting proposed change.
 - 2. No members opposed to change.

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 13 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

vii. Section 8:

1. AGFD, USFWS, NMDA, USFS, SCAT, ALL COUNTIES, WMAT, USDA-WS do not accept proposed change. Terry explained AGFD's reasoning to the group.
2. NMGFD in favor of proposed change.
3. Do not accept proposed change, but Johnson/Morgart will provide some clarification language on 10j.

viii. Section 8 (deletions):

1. NMGFD in favor of proposed change. Their position on this, and other proposed language changes on SOP 13, reflect the feeling that SOP 13, as has been applied (using strict application of the 3 strike approach), is not advancing the overriding effort to reintroduce wolves. Their comments, accordingly, are directed in an effort to provide a more proactive and flexible approach in determining wolf management actions.
2. USDA-WS, Graham, Greenlee, Navajo Co.'s, SCAT, USFS, NMDA, USFWS, AGFD, WMAT not in favor of adopting change.
3. Do not accept proposed change.

ix. Section 8 (bottom of paragraph – addition):

1. NMGFD in favor of proposed change.
2. USDA-WS, Graham, Greenlee, Navajo Co.'s, SCAT, USFS, NMDA, USFWS, AGFD, WMAT not in favor of adopting change.
3. USFS noted that it is not clear – does not understand the sentence. Matt explained that needs to be recognition that 3 strikes does not immediately mandate a removal order, and this language is trying to highlight that other management alternatives may apply under a 3-strike situation. Noted concern over malicious actions being taken knowing that 3 strikes is an automatic response to remove wolves from landscape (baiting issue – HCN article again referenced in group discussion accompanying this point). Cathy noted that she feels the discussions on alternatives, beyond automatic removal, do and have taken place at AMOC and that the proposed language is not necessary (doesn't like the wording, and she feels we already do what the language is intending to address). Morgart concurred with this assessment. AGFD/Terry noted that they feel the emphasis is misplaced, and that the 1st/2nd depredations should be where the management flexibility or "creativity" needs to be applied. Once 3 strikes is hit – time to remove the wolf/wolves as the pattern has been established – this was intent when SOP13 was established by AMOC early on.
4. USFWS agrees with the idea, but feels some different language can better capture the issue.
5. Do not accept proposed change.

x. Paragraph A/i:

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 14 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

1. NMGFD, USFWS, USFS, AGFD in favor of proposed change.
 2. USDA-WS, All Counties, SCAT, NMDA, WMAT no change.
 3. Accept proposed change (delete redundant language).
 - xi. Rationale:
 1. NMGFD in favor of proposed change.
 2. All but NMGFD vote to leave as is – no deletion.
 - t. DRAFT SOP 25.0 and 27.0
 - a. No Director comments received on both.
 - b. Any other comments received from others have been incorporated in the Deliberative Drafts by Terry.
 - c. SOP 25.0:
 - i. Vote to release to public at AMWG – all in favor of releasing to public at AMWG meeting today.
 - ii. Chris said he needs to verify that USDA-WS comments are addressed – will come back with any issues later (if their issues have not been satisfactorily addressed in this draft).
 - d. SOP 27.0:
 - i. Vote to release to public at AMWG – all in favor of releasing to public at AMWG meeting today.
 - e. Comment period for both to coincide with other established timelines.
 - u. Range Rider Proposal
 - a. Terry noted that no comments received thus far – deadline 2 weeks from today for any comments on this proposal. **Action Item.**
 - v. Project Roles/Responsibilities
 - a. Terry noted that no comments received thus far – deadline 2 weeks from today for any comments on this proposal. **Action Item.**
5. IFT UPDATES
- a. 2007 end of year count:
 - i. IFT will provide info at today's AMWG meeting. Standard update with having year-end count numbers.
 - ii. Count went well with helicopter time/effort: caught 10 wolves (collared/uncollared). WMAT did not have any captures due to terrain and other conditions. Overall, went well.
 - iii. 25 collared and 9 pups. Lower production than hoped/expected.
 - iv. Lofer pack – one animal had severe mange. Likely that pack numbers have been significantly reduced if not close to elimination due to this.
 - v. Oakleaf provided handout and provided verbal summary to group on information in this handout.

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 15 of 16

Note: this is not a public document

- vi. Positive observations on pairing of wolves. Oakleaf provided specific examples of wolves pairing that had previously not been paired – new pack formations.
 - vii. IFT will provide year-end count (report) by Feb 7, 2008 to AMOC (consistent with protocols). – **Action Item** for IFT.
 - b. Depredation/Nuisance Incidents:
 - i. Also referred to handout to summarize depredation activity and information.
 - c. Outreach Activities:
 - i. Summary provided in PowerPoint that will be covered in AMWG meeting today.
 - ii. Contacted 40 people in NM and 60 in AZ to obtain permission on end of year count and otherwise obtain information that would assist with count. Continued established reporting and updates done in past.
 - d. Other IFT Activities:
 - i. Annual IFT report will be submitted soon.
 - ii. Mike Godwin acknowledged the contributions of Colby Gardner, Ellen H, and Krista in getting the year-end count completed. Stepped up to the plate to see things through to a successful completion. AMOC shared the acknowledgement and noted their appreciation for the effort.
6. Other Business:
- a. IFT TDAs while positions are vacant: USFWS is looking at bringing in Maggie. NMGFD has options to provide short term coverage for vacancies, and hope that IFT Leader will not be vacant more than 1 month. Terry made point that vacancies in USFWS and NMGFD have not been filled in past and that process is taking too long.
 - b. Concept Statement – NMGFD. NMGFD is pursuing development of proactive management arrangements with private landowners now – contracts in process of being developed.
 - i. Matt stated that Director Thompson intends to provide AMOC revised/clarified version at some point.
 - c. Estimated funds being completed by AGFD/NMGFD.
 - d. Terry noted call for papers – Defenders workshop.
 - e. Research article distributed to AMOC. Just an FYI to everyone by Morgart to highlight technology that is available, which may be considered for wolf project. Warren Ballard is aware – publication in process.
 - f. Noted need to maintain contact sheet among all AMOC cooperators and lead agencies.
 - g. Terry will redistribute possible changes in format in AMWG meetings (workgroup formation, etc.) to AMOC for discussion/review at April AMOC meeting.
 - h. Press Releases on year-end count. USFWS prefers joint release with jurisdictions – MOU addresses this issue and the intent is to facilitate joint release. NMGFD,

Mexican Wolf Adaptive Management Oversight Committee Meeting

Final Summary Notes for January 29-30, 2008

Page 16 of 16

Note: this is ~~not~~ a public document

AGFD and WMAT will coordinate with USFWS as needed to make this collective/joint process work.

Meeting adjourned at 1120.

Document MW AMOC Summary Notes for Meeting of 20080129-30.Public Record.doc